

Issued July 12, 1913.

## United States Department of Agriculture,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

---

### NOTICE OF JUDGMENT NO. 2426.

(Given pursuant to section 4 of the Food and Drugs Act.)

---

**U. S. v. Alfred T. Bronaugh. Plea of guilty to first and third counts of the information. Fine, \$10. Second count of information nolle prossed.**

---

#### ADULTERATION AND MISBRANDING OF TINCTURE OF IODINE.

On January 21, 1913, the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of said District an information in three counts against Alfred T. Bronaugh, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendant at the District aforesaid, on June 17, 1912, of a quantity of tincture of iodine which was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "Tinct. Iodine. Poison! Caution! Antidote: \* \* \* A. T. Bronaugh Pharmacist, S. W. Cor. 7th and P. Sts., N. W., Wash. D. C."

Analysis of a sample of the product by the Bureau of Chemistry of this Department showed the following results: Iodine (grams per 100 cc), 4.40; potassium iodide (grams per 100 cc), 5.38; alcohol, 85 per cent. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the first count of the information for the reason that it was offered for sale and sold under and by a name, to wit, tincture of iodine, which name was recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia official at the time of the investigation, and said drug product differed from the standard of strength and purity as determined by the test laid down in said Pharmacopœia. Misbranding was alleged in the second count of the information for the reason that the product was branded and labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser in that the label bore the words and phrase "Tincture of Iodine," meaning and importing to

the purchaser thereof that the product was a tincture of iodine conforming to the standard set forth in the United States Pharmacopœia, whereas, in truth and in fact, it was not. Misbranding was alleged in the third count of the information for the reason that the product did not bear on the label thereof a statement of the quantity and proportion of alcohol contained therein

On January 21, 1913, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the first and third counts of the information and the court imposed a fine of \$10. A nolle prosequi was entered as to the second count of the information.

B. T. GALLOWAY,  
*Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 13, 1913.*

2426

○